

Quantum Symmetry

An Approach to Quantum Gauge Symmetry via Reconstruction Theorems

Reinhard Häring
 Institut für angewandte Mathematik
 c/o Lersnerstr. 19
 60322 Frankfurt
 Germany

October, 5, 1993

Abstract

The representations of the observable algebra of a low dimensional quantum field theory form the objects of a braided tensor category. The search for gauge symmetry in the theory amounts to finding an algebra which has the same representation category.

In this paper we try to establish that every quantum field theory satisfying some basic axioms possesses a weak quasi Hopf algebra as gauge symmetry. The first step is to construct a functor from the representation category to the category of finite dimensional vector spaces. Given such a functor we can use a generalized reconstruction theorem to find the symmetry algebra. It is shown how this symmetry algebra is used to build a gauge covariant field algebra and we investigate the question why this generality is necessary.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Braided Tensor Categories	3
2.1	Definitions	3
2.2	Semisimple and Irredundant Quasi Tensor Categories	6
2.2.1	Description of semisimple categories via polynomial equations	6
2.2.2	Construction of (weak) Quasi Tensor Functors	7
2.3	Examples of Quasi Tensor Categories	8
2.3.1	Representation Categories of quasitriangular ((weak) quasi) Hopf Algebras	8
2.3.2	Representation Categories of Observable Algebras	8
2.3.3	Ultra weak quasi Hopf algebras	9
3	Reconstruction Theorems	9
3.1	Majid's Reconstruction Theorem	9
3.1.1	Constructive Reconstruction	13
4	Gauge and Quantum Symmetry	14
4.1	Vertex SOS Transformation	15
4.2	Field Algebra $\mathcal{F}_{u1}$	16
4.3	Field Algebra $\mathcal{F}_{u2}$	20
5	Was it all worth it?	21
5.1	Truncation is unavoidable	21
5.2	Weak Quasi Hopf algebras are unavoidable	21
6	Remarks and open questions	21

1 Introduction

The structure of quantum field theories depends sensitive on the dimension of space time. It affects statistics and coupled with it gauge symmetry. It is by now well established (at least in the case of charges that can be localized in spacelike cones) that in four and more dimensions only permutation group statistics (i.e. Bose and Fermi statistics) is possible. In two space time dimension braid group statistic rules the exchange of operators. Between this antipodes fall three dimensional models which may have permutation or braid group statistics depending on the localization of charges. 'Dual' to statistics is the notion of gauge symmetry. It was shown by Doplicher and Roberts [2] that all field theories with permutation group statistics possess a (uniquely determined) compact gauge group. Until now a comparable result for braid group statistics has been lacking. Quantum groups (quasitriangular Hopf algebras) were supposed to replace the compact gauge groups. However it was soon realized that they have more representations than needed to serve as a gauge algebra. In one way or another one had to abandon these unphysical (indecomposable) representations and keep only the physical (fully decomposable) ones. The majority of researchers decided to accomplish this truncation simply by forgetting about them. While studying the Ising model Mack and Schomerus [11] noticed that this leads to contradictions. They introduced weak quasi Hopf algebras in [12] which are not plagued by unphysical representations (because truncation is build into their coproduct) and showed how they can be used to build a gauge covariant field algebra for the Ising model [13].

But still the situation was unsatisfactory. The Ising model remained the only example where the gauge algebra was explicitly known. A systematic procedure for constructing the gauge algebra was needed. Already Doplicher and Roberts had used categorical techniques. They realized that the relevant condition a gauge algebra must fulfil is that its representation category (the representations are the objects in this category and the intertwiners between them are the morphisms) is equivalent to the representation category of the observable algebra. Doplicher and Roberts were able to solve this problem, the reconstruction of an algebraic object from its representation theory, in the classical case. For braided categories Majid proved a reconstruction theorem. Given a (quasi) tensor functor from the category to the vector spaces this theorem reconstructs a (quasi) Hopf algebra. In the physical relevant cases such functors can't exist because of the need for truncation. Kerler [8] had the idea to generalize the reconstruction theorem to the case of weak quasi tensor functors (to allow truncation). He supposed that the reconstructed algebra would be a weak quasi Hopf algebra in the sense of Mack and Schomerus. However he was not able to give a proof and he guessed wrong requirements for the functor. Furthermore he couldn't give a construction of the needed weak quasi tensor functor. In this paper we repair this situation. We show that weak quasi tensor functors always exist and proof a generalized version of Majid's reconstruction theorem that allows the construction of weak quasi Hopf algebras. We carry out the reconstruction explicitly and find almost (The antipode diverges.) the same algebra as Mack and Schomerus constructed by hand. In contrast to the classical situation analysed by Doplicher/Roberts we find that the gauge algebra is not uniquely determined.

The next logical step is the construction of gauge covariant field algebra. This problem has already been attacked by many authors [23], [11], [28], [6], [5]. Our construction is generalizing¹ and correcting these works into a powerful construction that is model independent and close to physical intuition. The fields form an involutive algebra which acts on a Hilbert space with positive definite scalar product. The construction is symmetric

¹After the construction of the field algebra was completed we received a copy of Schomerus' PhD thesis [32]. He now has a field algebra that is as general as ours. We hope that our alternative construction will still be useful.

between the gauge and the observable algebra.

We prove braid und fusion relations in this field algebra. The field operators obey braid relations with the $\mathcal{R}$ matrix of the gauge algebra. This shows the deep interplay between symmetry and statistics.

Some material about ultra weak quasi Hopf algebras is spread across the paper which we suppose to be the right framework for the construction of chiral algebras (observable algebras).

2 Braided Tensor Categories

The occurence of representations with braiding properties in low dimensional quantum field theories motivates the introduction of generalized tensor categories which are not symmetric.

2.1 Definitions

The objects of a category $\mathcal{C}$ are denoted by $X \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$, the morphisms between $X, Y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ with $\text{Mor}(X, Y)$. $\text{End}(X) := \text{Mor}(X, X)$.

Definition 1 (Monoidal category, braided tensor category) *A category $\mathcal{C}$ is called monoidal if there is a functor $\tilde{\otimes}: \mathcal{C} \times \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \mathcal{C}$ obeying:*

1. *There are functorial isomorphisms:*

$$\Phi_{X,Y,Z} : X \tilde{\otimes} (Y \tilde{\otimes} Z) \xrightarrow{\sim} (X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \tilde{\otimes} Z \quad X, Y, Z \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}) \quad (1)$$

Φ satisfies the following **pentagon identity**:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \tilde{\otimes} (Y \tilde{\otimes} (Z \tilde{\otimes} T)) & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & (X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \tilde{\otimes} (Z \tilde{\otimes} T) \xrightarrow{\Phi} ((X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \tilde{\otimes} Z) \tilde{\otimes} T \\ \downarrow 1 \tilde{\otimes} \Phi & & \uparrow \Phi \tilde{\otimes} 1 \\ X \tilde{\otimes} ((Y \tilde{\otimes} Z) \tilde{\otimes} T) & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & (X \tilde{\otimes} (Y \tilde{\otimes} Z)) \tilde{\otimes} T \end{array} \quad (2)$$

Φ is called the **assoziator**.

2. *There is an **identity object** $1 \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$, such that $r_X : X \mapsto 1 \tilde{\otimes} X$ and $l_X : X \mapsto X \tilde{\otimes} 1$ are equivalences of categories compatible with Φ :*

$$\Phi_{1,X,Y} \circ l_{X \tilde{\otimes} Y} = l_X \tilde{\otimes} id_Y \quad (3)$$

r satisfies analog identities.

A monoidal category is called **braided tensor category** if there is a functorial isomorphism Ψ such that:

$$\Psi_{X,Y} : X \tilde{\otimes} Y \xrightarrow{\sim} Y \tilde{\otimes} X \quad X, Y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}) \quad (4)$$

Ψ satisfies two **hexagon identities** and is compatible with l and r .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X \tilde{\otimes} (Y \tilde{\otimes} Z) & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & (X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \tilde{\otimes} Z \xrightarrow{\Psi} Z \tilde{\otimes} (X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \\ \downarrow 1 \tilde{\otimes} \Psi & & \downarrow \Phi \\ X \tilde{\otimes} (Z \tilde{\otimes} Y) & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & (X \tilde{\otimes} Z) \tilde{\otimes} Y \xrightarrow{\Psi \tilde{\otimes} 1} (Z \tilde{\otimes} X) \tilde{\otimes} Y \end{array} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
(X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \tilde{\otimes} Z & \xrightarrow{\Phi^{-1}} & X \tilde{\otimes} (Y \tilde{\otimes} Z) \xrightarrow{\Psi} (Y \tilde{\otimes} Z) \tilde{\otimes} X \\
\downarrow \Psi \tilde{\otimes} 1 & & \downarrow \Phi^{-1} \\
(Y \tilde{\otimes} X) \tilde{\otimes} Z & \xrightarrow{\Phi^{-1}} & Y \tilde{\otimes} (X \tilde{\otimes} Z) \xrightarrow{1 \tilde{\otimes} \Psi} Y \tilde{\otimes} (Z \tilde{\otimes} X)
\end{array} \quad (6)$$

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
X \tilde{\otimes} Y & \xrightarrow{1 \tilde{\otimes} r} & X \tilde{\otimes} (Y \tilde{\otimes} 1) \\
\downarrow r \tilde{\otimes} 1 & & \downarrow 1 \tilde{\otimes} \Psi \\
(X \tilde{\otimes} 1) \tilde{\otimes} Y & \xrightarrow{\Phi} & X \tilde{\otimes} (1 \tilde{\otimes} Y)
\end{array} \quad (7)$$

Furthermore we demand $l_X = \Psi \circ r_X$. If $\Psi_{X,Y} \Psi_{Y,X} = id$, $\mathcal{C}$ is called **tensor category** or (in contrast to braided tensor categories) **symmetric tensor category**.

We assume all categories to be abelian (and all functors to additive) with direct sum $\tilde{\oplus}$ and zero element 0.

Definition 2 1. $X \in \mathcal{C}$ is called **indecomposable** if $Mor(X, X) = span id_X \oplus \mathcal{N}$ where $\mathcal{N}$ consists only of nilpotent elements. X is called **irreducible**, if $\mathcal{N} = 0$. The set of irreducible objects is denoted by Obj_{irr} . $\mathcal{C}$ is called **fully reducible**, if all $X \in Obj(\mathcal{C})$ are isomorph to sums of irreducible objects. A fully reducible category is called **Schur category**² if there are no morphisms between inequivalent irreducible objects.³

In a **rational category** there exist only finitely many equivalence classes of indecomposable objects. In a **quasi-rational category** every object is isomrphic to a finite sum of indecomposable objects.

$\mathcal{C}$ is called **irredundant**, if $X \cong Y \Rightarrow X = Y$.

A local finite (i.e. $\forall X, Y \in Obj(\mathcal{C}) \dim(Mor(X, Y)) < \infty$), abelian braided tensor category is called **semisimple**, if $Mor(X, X)$ is a semisimple algebra for all objects.

2. In a C^* -category $\mathcal{C}$ all $Mor(X, Y)$ are normed $\mathbb{C}$ -vector spaces with an antilinear involution $\dagger : Mor(X, Y) \rightarrow Mor(Y, X)$ such that $(fg)^\dagger = g^\dagger f^\dagger, ||f^\dagger f|| = ||f||^2$. $Mor(X, X)$ is then a unital C^* -algebra. Fully reducible C^* categories are Schur categories (Assume $f \in Mor(X, Y)$ to be a morphism between inequivalent, irreducible objects. $f^\dagger f \in Mor(X, X)$ and $ff^\dagger \in Mor(Y, Y)$. Just as f these maps can't be isos so they vanish. $0 = ||f^\dagger f|| = ||f||^2 \Rightarrow f = 0$).

3. A functor $F : \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ is called **faithful** if $F : Mor(X, Y) \rightarrow Mor(F(X), F(Y))$ is injective for all $X, Y \in Obj(\mathcal{C}_1)$.

By Wedderburn's theorem we get for locally finite categories:

Lemma 1 $X \in Obj(\mathcal{C})$ fully reducible $\iff End(X)$ semisimple.

$\mathcal{C}$ fully reducible $\iff \mathcal{C}$ semisimple

Definition 3 (Monoidal functor) A functor $F : \mathcal{C}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}_2$ between two monoidal categories is called **monoidal** (resp. **weakly monoidal**) if there is a functorial isomorphism (resp. epimorphism) $c_{X,Y}$

$$c_{X,Y} : F(X) \tilde{\otimes}_2 F(Y) \xrightarrow{\sim} F(X \tilde{\otimes}_1 Y) \quad (8)$$

²We thank A. Schmidt for pointing out the importance of this property.

³Categories of representation are by Schur's lemma Schur categories.

such that F becomes compatible with the associator and the unit:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(X) \tilde{\otimes} (F(Y) \tilde{\otimes} F(Z)) & \xrightarrow{1 \tilde{\otimes} c} & F(X) \tilde{\otimes} F(Y \tilde{\otimes} Z) \xrightarrow{c} F(X \tilde{\otimes} (Y \tilde{\otimes} Z)) \\ \downarrow \Phi_2 & & \downarrow F(\Phi_1) \\ (F(X) \tilde{\otimes} F(Y)) \tilde{\otimes} F(Z) & \xrightarrow{c \tilde{\otimes} 1} & F(X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \tilde{\otimes} F(Z) \xrightarrow{c} F((X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \tilde{\otimes} Z) \end{array} \quad (9)$$

$$l_2|_{F(\text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}_1))} = c^{-1} \circ F(l_1) : F(X) \mapsto F(1) \tilde{\otimes}_2 F(X) \cong 1 \tilde{\otimes}_2 F(X) \quad (10)$$

A functor between two (braided) tensor categories is called **symmetric** if it is compatible with the braid isomorphism, i.e. for all $X, Y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F(X) \tilde{\otimes} F(Y) & \xrightarrow{c} & F(X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \\ \downarrow \Psi_2 & & \downarrow F(\Psi_1) \\ F(Y) \tilde{\otimes} F(X) & \xrightarrow{c} & F(Y \tilde{\otimes} X) \end{array} \quad (11)$$

is commutative. A monoidal functor between braided tensor categories is called a **tensor functor**⁴ if:

$$F(\Psi(X \tilde{\otimes} Y)) \cong F(X \tilde{\otimes} Y) \quad (12)$$

In case (9) is not required F is called **quasi tensor functor** and if $c_{X,Y}$ is only an epimorphism (but with $c_{X,1}$ and $c_{1,X}$ remaining isomorphisms) with right inverse $c_{X,Y}^{-1}$ then F is only a **weak quasi tensor functor**. Finally F is called **ultra weak quasi tensor functor** if (10) and $c_{1,X}, c_{X,1}$ iso is not postulated but $c_{1,X} = c_{X,1} \circ \Psi^{\mathcal{C}_2}$.

If $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ are rigid (see below) then we demand⁵ in addition the existence of functorial isomorphisms $d_X : F(X)^* \rightarrow F(X^*)$.

$F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Set}}$ is called representable, if $\exists X \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ such that F is naturally isomorph to $Y \mapsto \text{Mor}(X, Y)$. X is called representing object.

Definition 4 (Internal Hom) One says that the (braided) tensor category $\mathcal{C}$ has an internal Hom, if $\forall X, Y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ the functor $Z \mapsto \text{Mor}(Z \tilde{\otimes} X, Y)$ is representable. The representing object is called $\text{Hom}(X, Y) \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$. So we have the following functorial isomorphism:

$$\text{Mor}(Z \tilde{\otimes} X, Y) \cong \text{Mor}(Z, \text{Hom}(X, Y)) \quad (13)$$

$X^* := \text{Hom}(X, 1)$ is called the dual object.

Setting $Z = 1$ yields $\text{Mor}(X, Y) \cong \text{Mor}(1, \text{Hom}(X, Y))$.

In the special case $Z = \text{Hom}(X, Y)$ the morphism which is mapped to the identity in $\text{Mor}(\text{Hom}(X, Y), \text{Hom}(X, Y))$ is denoted by $ev_{X,Y} : \text{Hom}(X, Y) \tilde{\otimes} X \rightarrow Y$ and called the **evaluation**. ev_X is a shorthand for $ev_{X,1}$. Dually we have the notion of coevaluation $coev_X \in \text{Mor}(1, X \tilde{\otimes} X^*)$ characterized by the dual relations

$$(ev_X \tilde{\otimes} id)(id \tilde{\otimes} coev_X) = id_{X^*} \quad (id \tilde{\otimes} ev_X)(coev_X \tilde{\otimes} id) = id_X \quad (14)$$

In rigid categories the existence of $coev$ ist guaranteed.

⁴This property follows in all cases with exception of the ultraweak case from the other axioms. One could therefore formulate most of the present paper using only the term monoidal functor.

⁵In the non-weak cases the existence of such isomorphisms follwos from rigidity by setting $F(X)^* := F(X^*), ev_{F(X)} := F(ev_X) \circ c$. [22]

Definition 5 (Rigid tensor category) A (braided) tensor category $\mathcal{C}$ with internal Hom is called **rigid**, if there are the following functorial isomorphisms ⁶:

$$\mathrm{Hom}(X_1, Y_1) \tilde{\otimes} \mathrm{Hom}(X_2, Y_2) \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathrm{Hom}(X_1 \tilde{\otimes} X_2, Y_1 \tilde{\otimes} Y_2) \quad (15)$$

$$X \xrightarrow{\sim} X^{**} \quad (16)$$

Setting $Y_1 = X_2 = 1, X_1 = X, Y_2 = Y$ and using (15) one obtains $\mathrm{Hom}(X, Y) \cong \mathrm{Hom}(X, 1) \tilde{\otimes} \mathrm{Hom}(1, Y) \cong X^* \tilde{\otimes} Y$ (The last isomorphism follows from (13) for $X = 1$).

2.2 Semisimple and Irredundant Quasi Tensor Categories

In the application we have in mind the categories are representation categories of algebras.

For an algebra A we let $\mathrm{Rep}(A)$ denote its **representation category**. The objects are the representations (eventually only special representations are considered, see below) of A and the morphisms are the intertwiners.

$\mathrm{Rep}(A)$ is a braided tensor category if A permits products of representations which are symmetric upto isomorphisms.

As in representation theory we want to abandon the complications of equivalent but yet distinct objects.

Note 1 On can associate to $\mathcal{C}$ a irredundant category $[\mathcal{C}]$ which is by definition a full subcategory of $\mathcal{C}$ containing one object in every equivalence class. $[\mathcal{C}]$ is called a *skeleton* of $\mathcal{C}$ in [10].

Note 2 Kerler [8] showed that to every rigid braided tensor category $\mathcal{C}$ there exists a canonically associated semisimple quotient braided tensor category $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C})$. This construction is compatible with the elimination of redundancy [7]: $[\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{C})] = \mathcal{S}([\mathcal{C}])$

2.2.1 Description of semisimple categories via polynomial equations

Let $\mathcal{C}$ denote a semisimple braided Schur tensor category and let $\nabla_0 \subset \mathrm{Obj}_{irr}(\mathcal{C})$ contain one object per irreducible equivalence class. For each triple $X, Y, Z \in \nabla_0$ let $N_{X,Y}^Z$ denote the dimension of $\mathrm{Mor}(X \tilde{\otimes} Y, Z)$ and choose a basis $\phi(e) \in \mathrm{Mor}(X \tilde{\otimes} Y, Z)$ ($e = {}^i \binom{Z}{X Y}$ is a multi index with $i \in \{1, \dots, N_{X,Y}^Z\}$). $\phi^i \binom{Z}{X Y} \circ \Psi_{Y,X} \in \mathrm{Mor}(Y \tilde{\otimes} X, Z)$ and $\phi^i \binom{R}{X M} \circ (id_X \tilde{\otimes} \phi^j \binom{M}{Y Z}) \in \mathrm{Mor}(X \tilde{\otimes} (Y \tilde{\otimes} Z))$ can then be expanded in the base via matrices

$$\phi(e) \circ \Psi = \sum_f \Omega_{e,f} \phi(f) \quad (17)$$

$$\phi(e_2)(id \otimes \phi(e_1))(h_2 \otimes h_1 \otimes h_s) = \sum_{e,f} F_{e_1, e_2; f, e} \phi(e)(\phi(f) \otimes id)(h_2 \otimes h_1 \otimes h_s) \quad (18)$$

It follows straightforward from the axioms of braided tensor categories that these matrices satisfy the Moore/Seiberg polynomial equations.

Moore/Seiberg have shown ([24],[9]) that in the opposite direction every solution to their equations yields such a category. Their construction is essentially the following: Take a set of irreducible objects $X_i, i \in \mathcal{I}$ and set $\mathrm{Mor}(X_i, X_j) := \mathbb{C} \delta_{i,j} id_{X_i}$. Tensor products are formally introduced via $X_i \tilde{\otimes} X_j := \bigoplus_l V_{i,j}^l \otimes X_l$ where $V_{i,j}^l$ are $N_{i,j}^l$ dimensional vector spaces of morphisms $\mathrm{Mor}(X_i \tilde{\otimes} X_j, X_l)$. The braid iso operates on this tensor product via the operation of Ω on $V_{i,j}^l$.

⁶Equations (15) and (13) allow to determine $(A \tilde{\otimes} B)^* = A^* \tilde{\otimes} B^*$ by setting $Y = 1, X = A \tilde{\otimes} B$.

2.2.2 Construction of (weak) Quasi Tensor Functors

Let $\nabla_0 \subset \text{Obj}_{\text{irr}}(\mathcal{C})$ contain one object per irreducible equivalence class. ∇_0^* can be different from ∇_0 but it shares the same properties since the dual of an irreducible (indecomposable) object is again irreducible (indecomposable).

Definition 6 A function defined on the irreducible objects of a semisimple, rigid braided Schur tensor category $D : \text{Obj}_{\text{irr}}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ which is constant on equivalence classes is called **weak dimension function**, if:

$$D(1) = 1, D(X) = D(X^*), D(X)D(Y) \geq \sum_{Z \in \nabla_0} D(Z) \dim(\text{Mor}(X \tilde{\otimes} Y, Z)) \quad (19)$$

D is called **dimension function** if equality holds.

Dimension functions allow according to ideas of Kerler⁷ [8] the construction of functors:

Proposition 2 Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a quasi-rational semisimple, rigid braided Schur tensor category and $D : \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ a (weak) dimension function. Then there is a faithful (weak) quasi tensor functor $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \underline{\text{Vec}}$ into the category of finite dimensional vectorspaces.

Proof: For $X \in \nabla_0$ let $F(X) := \mathbb{C}^{D(X)}$ and for arbitrary objects $Y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C})$ this is extended via $F(Y) := \bigoplus_{X \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(X, Y) \otimes F(X)$. F acts on morphisms $f \in \text{Mor}(Y_1, Y_2)$ as $F(f) \in \text{Mor}(F(Y_1), F(Y_2))$. Because of linearity, $F(f)$ needs only be defined on the summands of type $\text{Mor}(X, Y_1) \otimes F(X)$. Let $F(f)(g \otimes x) := f \circ g \otimes x, x \in F(X), g \in \text{Mor}(X, Y_1)$

Assume $f_1, f_2 \in \text{Mor}(Y_1, Y_2), F(f_1) = F(f_2)$. By the definition of F this implies $\forall X \in \nabla_0 \forall g \in \text{Mor}(X, Y_1) f_1 \circ g = f_2 \circ g$. Since $\mathcal{C}$ is assumed to be semisimple we have an isomorphism $\phi \in \text{Mor}(Y_1, X_{i_1} \oplus \dots \oplus X_{i_n}), X_{i_l} \in \nabla_0$. From this we get $p_{i_l} \in \text{Mor}(Y_1, X_{i_l}), q_{i_l} \in \text{Mor}(X_{i_l}, Y_1)$ such that $\phi = \sum_l q_{i_l} \circ p_{i_l}$. Now ϕ is epi and we have $f_1 \circ q_{i_l} = f_2 \circ q_{i_l}$ by the above remark. Hence $f_1 \circ \phi = f_2 \circ \phi$ and by this $f_1 = f_2$: F is faithful.

F satisfies $F(Y^*) \cong F(Y)^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} F(Y^*) &= \bigoplus_{X \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(X, Y^*) \otimes F(X) \cong \bigoplus_{X \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(X^*, Y^*) \otimes F(X^*) \\ &\cong \bigoplus_{X \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(X, Y)^* \otimes F(X^*) \cong \bigoplus_{X \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(X, Y)^* \otimes F(X)^* = F(Y)^* \end{aligned}$$

Functoriality of $*$ is used in the third step and the fourth step uses the fact that $F(X)$ and $F(X^*)$ are vector spaces of equal dimension.

For every pair of irreducible objects $X_1, X_2 \in \nabla_0$ we choose an arbitrary (epi/iso)morphism

$$C_{X_1, X_2} : F(X_1) \otimes F(X_2) \rightarrow F(X_1 \tilde{\otimes} X_2) = \bigoplus_{X \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(X, X_1 \tilde{\otimes} X_2) \otimes F(X)$$

c is defined as extension of C :

$$\begin{aligned} c_{Y_1, Y_2} &: F(Y_1) \otimes F(Y_2) \rightarrow F(Y_1 \tilde{\otimes} Y_2) \\ c_{Y_1, Y_2} &: \left(\bigoplus_{X_1 \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(X_1, Y_1) \otimes F(X_1) \right) \otimes \left(\bigoplus_{X_2 \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(X_2, Y_2) \otimes F(X_2) \right) \\ &\rightarrow \bigoplus_{X \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(X, Y_1 \tilde{\otimes} Y_2) \otimes F(X) \\ c_{Y_1, Y_2} &:= \bigoplus_{X_1, X_2 \in \nabla_0} (\Gamma \otimes id) \circ C_{X_1, X_2} \circ \tau_{2,3} \end{aligned}$$

$$\Gamma : \text{Mor}(X_1, Y_1) \otimes \text{Mor}(X_2, Y_2) \otimes \text{Mor}(X, X_1 \tilde{\otimes} X_2) \rightarrow \text{Mor}(X, Y_1 \tilde{\otimes} Y_2)$$

$$\Gamma(f_1 \otimes f_2 \otimes g) := (f_1 \tilde{\otimes} f_2) \circ g$$

⁷In the weak case Kerler's idea is wrong: His $C_{i,j}$ can't be chosen as epimorphisms as required. The Ising model is a counterexample.

□

Proposition 2 reduces the problem of finding a functor to finding a dimension function. This is always possible:

Proposition 3 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the observable algebra of a QFT. On $\mathcal{C} := [\text{Rep}(\mathcal{A})]$ there exist always weak dimension functions. An example is*

$$D_1(1) := 1 \quad D_1(X) := \dim \bigoplus_{Y, Z \in \nabla_0} \text{Mor}(Y \overset{\sim}{\otimes} X, Z) = \sum_{i,j} N_{X,i}^j \quad (20)$$

In the algebraic formulation of QFT we have another possibility.

$$D_2(\rho) := \dim(\text{span}\{(\rho_I \rho, \rho_J) \mid \rho_I, \rho_J \in \nabla_0\}) \quad (21)$$

A third possibility was found by Schomerus [32]:

$$D_3(1) := 1 \quad D_3(\rho) := C \quad C := \max_{I,J \neq 0} \sum_K N_{I,J}^K \quad (22)$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(X)D_1(Y) &= \left(\sum_{s,r} N_{X,s}^r \right) \left(\sum_{S,R} N_{Y,S}^R \right) = \sum_{s,r,S,R} N_{X,s}^r N_{Y,S}^R \geq \\ &= \sum_{K,N,M} N_{X,N}^K N_{Y,K}^M = \sum_{K,N,M} N_{X,Y}^K N_{K,N}^M = D_1(X \overset{\sim}{\otimes} Y) \end{aligned}$$

□

2.3 Examples of Quasi Tensor Categories

2.3.1 Representation Categories of quasitriangular ((weak) quasi) Hopf Algebras

Representations of a Hopf algebra H form a monoidal category $\text{Rep}(H)$. The objects are the representations and the morphisms are the intertwiners between them. It is braided if H is quasitriangular. The braid isomorphism is naturally given by

$$\Psi(v_1 \overset{\sim}{\otimes} v_2) := \tau \circ (\varrho^1 \otimes \varrho^2)(R)(v_1 \overset{\sim}{\otimes} v_2) \quad (23)$$

For triangular Hopf algebras this is a symmetric tensor category, while for QTHA it is a braided one.

The subcategory $\text{Rep}(H)^{fd}$ of finite dimensional representations is rigid thanks to the conjugated representation.

2.3.2 Representation Categories of Observable Algebras

The category of local charge representations of the algebra of observables $\mathcal{A}$ in algebraic quantum field theory is ideal: It possesses all the properties defined in the beginning of this chapter.

$$\text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}) = \nabla \quad \text{proper morphisms} \overset{\sim}{=} \text{representations} \quad (24)$$

$$\text{Mor}(\rho_1, \rho_2) = (\rho_2, \rho_1) \quad \text{intertwiner} \quad (25)$$

$$\overset{\sim}{\otimes} = \overset{\sim}{\times} \quad \rho_1 \overset{\sim}{\times} \rho_2 := \rho_1 \circ \rho_2 \quad 1 = \rho_0 = id \quad (26)$$

$$T_1 \circ T_2 = T_1 T_2 \quad T^\dagger = T^* \quad \rho^* = \bar{\rho} \quad (27)$$

$$\Psi \overset{\sim}{=} \sigma_\epsilon \quad (28)$$

$$ev_X \overset{\sim}{=} \tilde{R}^* := R^* d_\rho^{1/2} \quad coev_X \overset{\sim}{=} \tilde{\bar{R}} := \epsilon_{\bar{\rho}, \rho} \tilde{R} \quad (29)$$

Note 3 In general we use the term quantum field theory (QFT) in a weaker sense that includes (among others) also CQFT (for example in the axiomatic framework of [5]). We assume that one has a distinguished algebra $\mathcal{A}$ (observable algebra, chiral Algebra which has direct sums, tensor products, involution and charge conjugation (rigid)).

2.3.3 Ultra weak quasi Hopf algebras

Is there some kind of algebra generalizing the ((weak) quasi) quantum groups and observable algebras? We believe that ultra weak quasi quantum groups as introduced in [7] may provide an answer.

Definition 7 (Ultra weak quasi Hopf algebra) An A -ultra weak quasi Hopf algebra H (A an unital algebra) is a A bialgebra H (left and right multiplication are denoted by $\mu_l : A \otimes H \rightarrow H, \mu_r : H \otimes A \rightarrow H$) and algebra morphisms $\eta : A \rightarrow H, \epsilon : H \rightarrow A$ such that all axioms of a weak quasi Hopf algebra are fulfilled with the exception of unit/counit properties which are replaced by:

$$\mu_l(\epsilon \otimes id)\Delta = \mu_r(id \otimes \epsilon)\Delta = id_H \quad m(id \otimes \eta) = \mu_r \quad m(\eta \otimes id) = \mu_l \quad (30)$$

3 Reconstruction Theorems

Historically the first reconstruction theorem was the famous Tannaka-Krein theorem: Given a symmetric tensor category and a functor to Vec there is a group with the given category as representation category. Majid has proved reconstruction theorems for quasitriangular Hopf algebras and quasi Hopf algebras. A reconstruction theorem for weak quasi Hopf algebras was suggested by Kerler without a proof. However he demands some kind of symmetric-weak tensor functor which cannot exist according to a simple argument by Kenrik Kratz [9].

The **forgetful functor** $V : \text{Rep}(H) \rightarrow \underline{Vec}$ assigns to each representation the underlying vector space.

3.1 Majid's Reconstruction Theorem

Theorem 4 (Generalized Majid's first reconstruction theorem) ⁸ Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a rigid braided tensor category and $F : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \underline{Vec}$ a monoidal functor. Then there is a maximal algebra $(H, R) = H(\mathcal{C}, F)$, unique upto isomorphism, and an induced functor $G : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(H)$, such that $\mathcal{C} \xrightarrow{G} \text{Rep}(H) \xrightarrow{V} \underline{Vec}$ composes to F . G maps inequivalent objects to inequivalent representations. G is always full and G is faithful iff F is faithful. G is surjective as a map of objects of irredundant categories if $\mathcal{C}$ is semisimple and Schur.⁹ $\text{Rep}(H)$ is rigid if F is faithful and it is C^* if $\mathcal{C}$ is so. The structure matrices (see section 2.2.1) coincide. The structure of H is determined by F :

F is tensor functor $\implies H$ is quasitriangular Hopf algebra

F is quasi tensor functor $\implies H$ is quasitriangular quasi Hopf algebra

F is weak quasi tensor functor $\implies H$ is quasitriangular weak quasi Hopf algebra

F is ultra weak quasi tensor functor $\implies H$ is quasitr. ultra weak quasi Hopf algebra

If $\underline{Vec}$ is replaced by the category of finite dimensional Hilbert spaces H has an involution $*$: $H \rightarrow H$ such that $(gh)^* = h^*g^*, \Delta(h^*) = \Delta(h)^*, \epsilon(h^*) = \overline{\epsilon(h)}, S^{-1}(h^*) = S(h)^*$ with $(g \otimes h)^* = g^* \otimes h^*$.

⁸The generalization to weak quasi Hopf algebras was suggested by Kerler without proof and with wrong assumptions. The correct formulation and the proof are believed to be new as are the ultra weak case, the involution and the proof of injectivity and surjectivity of G .

⁹Hence in the case of a faithful functor and a semisimple Schur category we have $[\mathcal{C}] \cong [\text{Rep}(H)]$ and therefore $\mathcal{C}$ and $\text{Rep}(H)$ are equivalent categories.

H is explicitly given by $H = \{h : \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \text{End}_{\text{Vec}} \mid h_X \in \text{End}(F(X)), F(f) \circ h_X = h_Y \circ F(f) \mid X, Y \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}), f \in \text{Mor}(X, Y)\}$. The functions h are called *covariant*.

Proof: H becomes a vector space by pointwise addition. The multiplication is also defined pointwise: $(hg)_X := h_X \circ g_X \mid X \in \text{Obj}(\mathcal{C}), h, g \in H$. The unit is $X \mapsto 1_X = \text{id}_{F(X)}$. (The ultra weak case is handled at the end of the proof.)

In Vec the following relation holds¹⁰: $\text{End}(F(X)) \otimes \text{End}(F(Y)) \cong \text{End}(F(X) \otimes F(Y))$. $H \otimes H$ is given by functions in two variables X, Y , which map to $\text{End}(F(X) \otimes F(Y))$. The coproduct $\Delta : H \rightarrow H \otimes H$ is defined by:

$$\Delta(h)_{X,Y} := c_{X,Y}^{-1} \circ h_{X \otimes Y} \circ c_{X,Y} \quad (31)$$

This is compatible with multiplication:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta(h)\Delta(g))_{X,Y} &= \Delta(h)_{X,Y}\Delta(g)_{X,Y} = c_{X,Y}^{-1} h_{X \otimes Y} c_{X,Y} c_{X,Y}^{-1} g_{X \otimes Y} c_{X,Y} = \\ &= c_{X,Y}^{-1} h_{X \otimes Y} g_{X \otimes Y} c_{X,Y} = \Delta(hg)_{X,Y} \end{aligned}$$

The counit is $\epsilon : H \rightarrow \mathbb{C}, \epsilon(h) := h_1$.

$$((1 \otimes \epsilon)\Delta(h))_X = \Delta(h)_{X,1} = c_{X,1}^{-1} h_{X \otimes 1} c_{X,1} = h_{X \otimes 1} = h_X$$

The associator $\phi \in H \otimes H \otimes H$ is given by $\phi_{X,Y,Z} := (c_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes 1) c_{X \otimes Y, Z}^{-1} F(\Phi_{X,Y,Z}) c_{X,Y \otimes Z} (1 \otimes c_{Y,Z})$. For tensor functors this is trivial because of (9). For quasi tensor functors it is invertible.

$$\begin{aligned} (\phi(1 \otimes \Delta)\Delta(h))_{X,Y,Z} &= \phi_{X,Y,Z} (c_{X,Y \otimes Z} (1 \otimes c_{Y,Z}))^{-1} h_{X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)} c_{X,Y \otimes Z} (1 \otimes c_{Y,Z}) \\ &= (c_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes 1) c_{X \otimes Y, Z}^{-1} F(\Phi_{X,Y,Z}) h_{X \otimes (Y \otimes Z)} c_{X,Y \otimes Z} (1 \otimes c_{Y,Z}) \\ ((\Delta \otimes 1)\Delta(h)\phi)_{X,Y,Z} &= (c_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes 1) c_{X \otimes Y, Z}^{-1} h_{(X \otimes Y) \otimes Z} c_{X \otimes Y, Z} (c_{X,Y} \otimes 1) \phi_{X,Y,Z} \\ &= (c_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes 1) c_{X \otimes Y, Z}^{-1} h_{(X \otimes Y) \otimes Z} F(\Phi_{X,Y,Z}) c_{X,Y \otimes Z} (1 \otimes c_{Y,Z}) \end{aligned}$$

Both expressions are the same because of covariance: " $F(\Phi)h = hF(\Phi)$ " This shows quasi coassociativity. For tensor functors this reduces to coassociativity and for weak quasi tensor functors ϕ remains quasi invertible.

For the proof of $(id \otimes id \otimes \Delta)(\phi) \cdot (\Delta \otimes id \otimes id)(\phi) = (1 \otimes \phi)(id \otimes \Delta \otimes id)(\phi)(\phi \otimes 1)$. we refer to Majid's original work [17] or [7].

F is a functor between rigid braided tensor categories. There are isomorphisms $d_X : F(X)^* \cong F(X^*)$ and $d_X^* : F(X^*)^* \cong F(X)$. They are used in the definition of the antipode:

$$(Sh)_X := d_X^* (h_{X^*})^* d_X^{*-1} \quad (32)$$

We omit the proof of the antipode identity¹¹ which may be found in [7].

H is quasitriangular by means of $R \in H \otimes H$:

$$R_{X,Y} := \Psi_{F(X), F(Y)}^{\text{Vec}-1} c_{Y,X}^{-1} F(\Psi_{X,Y}) c_{X,Y} \quad (33)$$

R relates the coproduct and the opposite coproduct:

$$\begin{aligned} (R\Delta(h)R^{-1})_{X,Y} &= \Psi_{F(X), F(Y)}^{\text{Vec}-1} c_{Y,X}^{-1} F(\Psi_{X,Y}) c_{X,Y} c_{X,Y}^{-1} h_{X \otimes Y} c_{X,Y} \\ &= c_{X,Y}^{-1} F(\Psi_{X,Y})^{-1} c_{Y,X} \Psi_{F(X), F(Y)}^{\text{Vec}} \\ &= \Psi_{F(X), F(Y)}^{\text{Vec}-1} c_{Y,X}^{-1} F(\Psi_{X,Y}) h_{X \otimes Y} F(\Psi_{X,Y})^{-1} c_{Y,X} \Psi_{F(X), F(Y)}^{\text{Vec}} \\ &= \Psi_{F(X), F(Y)}^{\text{Vec}-1} c_{Y,X}^{-1} h_{\Psi(X \otimes Y)} c_{Y,X} \Psi_{F(X), F(Y)}^{\text{Vec}} \\ &= \Delta'(h)_{X,Y} \end{aligned}$$

¹⁰In the Hilbert space case this is only an injection. We then have to project on the image of this injection. Alternatively we may regard $\text{End}(F(X)) = B(F(X))$ as von Neumann algebra over the hilbert space $F(X)$ and take the weak closure of the tensor product factors.

¹¹The antipode identity (or even a stronger identity) is considered to be essential by Mack/Schomerus for consistent transformation laws of adjoint field operators. We don't need this assumption in our approach.

For the proof of the other two quasitriangularity equations we refer once more to [16] and [7].

In the weak case one has in addition to verify:

$$\phi^{-1}\phi = (id \otimes \Delta)\Delta(1) \quad (34)$$

$$\phi\phi^{-1} = (\Delta \otimes id)\Delta(1) \quad (35)$$

$$RR^{-1} = \Delta'(1) \quad (36)$$

$$R^{-1}R = \Delta(1) \quad (37)$$

$$(id \otimes id \otimes \epsilon)(\phi) = (id \otimes \epsilon \otimes id)(\phi) = (\epsilon \otimes id \otimes id)(\phi) = \Delta(1) \quad (38)$$

$$(39)$$

This is easily done using $cc^{-1} = 1, c^{-1}c \neq 1$: For (38) we calculate:

$$(id \otimes id \otimes \epsilon)(\phi)_{X,Y} = (c_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes 1)c_{X \otimes Y,1}^{-1} F(\Phi_{X,Y,1})c_{X,Y}(1 \otimes c_{Y,1}) = (c_{X,Y}^{-1})c_{X,Y} = \Delta(1)_{X,Y}$$

And for (37):

$$(R^{-1}R)_{X,Y} = c_{X,Y}^{-1}F(\Psi_{X,Y}^{-1})c_{Y,X}\Psi_{F(X),F(Y)}^{\text{Vec}}\Psi_{F(X),F(Y)}^{\text{Vec}-1}c_{Y,X}^{-1}F(\Psi_{X,Y})c_{X,Y} = c_{X,Y}^{-1}c_{X,Y} = \Delta(1)_{X,Y}$$

Similarly one gets¹² (35):

$$\begin{aligned} & \phi_{X,Y,Z} \circ \phi_{X,Y,Z}^{-1} \\ &= (c_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes id)c_{X \otimes Y,Z}^{-1}F(\Phi_{X,Y,Z})c_{X,Y \otimes Z}(id \otimes c_{Y,Z}) \\ & \quad (id \otimes c_{Y,Z}^{-1})c_{X,Y \otimes Z}^{-1}F(\Phi_{X,Y,Z})^{-1}c_{X \otimes Y,Z}(c_{X,Y} \otimes id) \\ &= (c_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes id)c_{X \otimes Y,Z}^{-1}c_{X \otimes Y,Z}(c_{X,Y} \otimes id) \\ &= (c_{X,Y}^{-1} \otimes id)\Delta(1)_{X \otimes Y,Z}(c_{X,Y} \otimes 1) \\ &= ((\Delta \otimes id)\Delta(1))_{X,Y,Z}. \end{aligned}$$

(34) is proven in the same way, just as (36).

The vector spaces $F(X)$ are representation spaces of H : $\varrho_X(h).v := h_X(v) \quad h \in H, v \in F(X)$. This induces a functor $\mathcal{C} \rightarrow \text{Rep}(H)$. Morphisms $f \in \text{Mor}(X, Y)$ are mapped to intertwiners $G(f) = F(f)$: $G(f) \circ \varrho_X(h) = F(f) \circ h_X = h_Y \circ F(f) = \varrho_Y(h) \circ G(f)$.

The proof of surjectivity needs lemma 5. It shows that for semisimple Schur categories H is a direct sum of full matrix algebras $M_n(\mathbb{C})$. Each of them has only one irrep. And so H has no other irreducible representations, because all representations have to reflect commutativity of the summands and must therefore annihilate all summands but one. Therefore H has no more irreducible representations than $[\mathcal{C}]$ has irreducible objects. Since F and G are linear this shows that G is surjective when G is considered as a map of objects of irredundant categories.

G is full, because every morphism T in $\text{Rep}(H)$ ($T\varrho^Y = \varrho^X T$) is a constraint that can only exist if it is of the form $T = F(f)$.

The proof of injectivity is simpler: Assume X, Y to be inequivalent objects which are mapped to equivalent representations, i.e. $F(X) = F(Y), \forall h \in H, h_X = \varphi \circ h_Y \circ \varphi^{-1}$ with an isomorphism $\varphi : F(X) \rightarrow F(Y) = F(X)$. So the value of h on X is determined uniquely by its value on Y . This can be done by covariance only if $\exists f \in \text{Mor}(X, Y) \exists g \in \text{Mor}(Y, X)$ such that $F(f) = \varphi, F(g) = \varphi^{-1}$. But then (by faithfulness) f and g are iso ($id_{F(Y)} = F(f)F(g) = F(fg)$; because of faithfulness only id_Y is mapped to $id_{F(Y)}$ and hence $f = g^{-1}$) contracting our hypothesis.

Describe $\mathcal{C}$ as in subsection 2.2.1. According to this presentation we have for $X, Y, Z \in \nabla_0$ matrices Ω that satisfy $\phi^i(\begin{smallmatrix} Z \\ X \ Y \end{smallmatrix}) \circ \Psi_{Y,X} = \sum_j \Omega_{i,j} \phi^j(\begin{smallmatrix} Z \\ Y \ X \end{smallmatrix})$. We apply F , multiply c from the right, introduce $1 = cc^{-1}$ and use linearity of F to get $F(\phi^i(\begin{smallmatrix} Z \\ X \ Y \end{smallmatrix})) \circ c \circ c^{-1} \circ \Psi_{Y,X} \circ c = \sum_j \Omega_{i,j} F(\phi^j(\begin{smallmatrix} Z \\ Y \ X \end{smallmatrix})) \circ c$. This shows¹³ that $\mathcal{C}$ and $\text{Rep}(H)$ have the same structure constants.

$\text{Rep}(H)$ is c^* by $F(f)^\dagger = F(f^\dagger)$ and it is rigid if F is faithful: To ϱ_X there is the dual representation ϱ_{X^*} such that $\varrho_X \cong \varrho_{X^{**}}$. The internal Hom is $\text{Hom}(X, Y) = X^* \tilde{\otimes} Y$. To proof

¹²This calculation was carried out by H. Kratz.

¹³Note that $F(\phi^i(\begin{smallmatrix} Z \\ X \ Y \end{smallmatrix})) \circ c$ form a base of morphisms in $\text{Mor}(F(X) \otimes F(Y), F(Z))$. They are linearly independent: Assume $\sum_i \alpha_i F(\phi^i(\begin{smallmatrix} Z \\ X \ Y \end{smallmatrix})) \circ c$. By surjectivity of c and linearity of F this implies $0 = F(\sum_i \alpha_i \phi^i(\begin{smallmatrix} Z \\ X \ Y \end{smallmatrix}))$ and faithfulness of F yields a contradiction. Further they span the whole space since G is full.

this one has to show $\text{Mor}(\varrho_Z \tilde{\otimes} \varrho_X, \varrho_Y) \cong \text{Mor}(\varrho_Z, \varrho_{X^*} \tilde{\otimes} \varrho_Y)$. The isomorphism α is explicitly given by the following construction: Take an intertwiner $T \in \text{Mor}(\varrho_Z \tilde{\otimes} \varrho_X, \varrho_Y)$

$$\varrho_Y(h)T = T(\varrho_Z \tilde{\otimes} \varrho_X)(h) \Leftrightarrow h_Y T = T c^{-1} h_{Z \tilde{\otimes} X} c \Rightarrow h_Y T c^{-1} = T c^{-1} h_{Z \tilde{\otimes} X}$$

This implies $T c^{-1} = F(f)$ and if F is faithful f is unique. $\mathcal{C}$ is rigid $\Rightarrow \exists ! g \in \text{Mor}(Z, X^* \tilde{\otimes} Y)$

$$h_{X^* \tilde{\otimes} Y} F(g) = F(g) h_Z \Leftrightarrow c(\varrho_{X^*} \tilde{\otimes} \varrho_Y)(h) c^{-1} F(g) = F(g) \varrho_Z(h)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow c^{-1} c(\varrho_{X^*} \tilde{\otimes} \varrho_Y)(h) c^{-1} F(g) = c^{-1} F(g) \varrho_Z(h)$$

$c^{-1}c$ is nothing but $\Delta(1)$ and can therefore be omitted. It is easy to see that $\alpha(T) := c^{-1}F(g)$ constructed this way is iso.

The involution is given by: $(h^*)_X := (h_X)^*$. Multiplicativity carries over from vector space endomorphisms. $\Delta(h^*) = \Delta(h)^*$ can be proven by assuming the $c_{X,Y}$ without loss of generality to be isometries: $\Delta(h)_{X,Y}^* = (c_{X,Y}^{-1} \circ h_{X \tilde{\otimes} Y} \circ c_{X,Y})^* = c_{X,Y}^{-1} \circ h_{X \tilde{\otimes} Y}^* \circ c_{X,Y}$. If d is unitary then $S(h)^* = S^{-1}(h^*)$, because of:

$$\begin{aligned} S(S(h)^*)_X &= d_X^* \circ ((S(h)^*)_{X^*})^* \circ d_X^{*-1} = d_X^* \circ ((S(h)_{X^*}^*)^* \circ d_X^{*-1}) = d_X^* \circ (S(h)_{X^*}) \circ d_X^{*-1} \\ &= d_X^* \circ d_{X^*}^* \circ h_X^* \circ d_{X^*}^{*-1} \circ d_X^{*-1} = d_X^* \circ d_X \circ h_X^* \circ d_X^{-1} \circ d_X^{*-1} = h_X^* = (h^*)_X \end{aligned}$$

The square of the antipode is in the unitary case: $S(S(h))_X = d_X^* \circ (S(h)_{X^*})^* \circ d_X^{*-1} = d_X^* \circ (d_{X^*}^* \circ h_X^* \circ d_{X^*}^{*-1})^* \circ d_X^{*-1} = d_X^* \circ d_{X^*}^{-1} \circ h_X \circ d_{X^*} \circ d_X^{*-1} = d_X^* \circ d_X \circ h_X \circ d_X^* \circ d_X = (u^* h u)_X$ with $u_X := d_X^* \circ d_X$.

The representations of H are unitary: $\varrho(h^*) = \varrho(h)^*$.

Let's have a look at the ultra weak case. H becomes a $\text{End}(F(1))$ -ultra weak Quasi-Hopf algebra with the following bimodule actions:

$$\mu_l(a \otimes h)_X := c_{1,X} \circ (a \otimes h) \circ c_{1,X}^{-1} \quad \mu_r(h \otimes a)_X := c_{X,1} \circ (h \otimes a) \circ c_{X,1}^{-1} \quad a \in \text{End}(F(1)) \quad (40)$$

The definition of ϵ doesn't have to be changed but the unit is now defined more general to be

$$\eta(a) := \mu_l(a \otimes 1) = \mu_r(1 \otimes a) \quad (41)$$

The counit property is fulfilled:

$$(\mu_l(\epsilon \otimes id) \Delta(h))_X = c_{1,X} c_{1,X}^{-1} \circ h_{1 \tilde{\otimes} X} \circ c_{1,X} c_{1,X}^{-1} = h_X$$

□

Note 4 1. The existence of a weak quasi tensor functor for the representation categories of observable algebras in quantum field theories was already proven, so that we can now state our first main result: **Every quantum field theory possesses a (not uniquely determined) weak quasi Hopf algebra as possible gauge symmetry algebra.**

2. Let F be as in proposition 2. The choice of the arbitrary epimorphisms $C_{X,Y}$ has no impact on $H(\mathcal{C}, F)$. Suppose that $\tilde{C}_{X,Y}$ is another choice and denote by $\tilde{F}$ the functor constructed this way. $\tilde{c}_{X,Y} : \tilde{F}(X) \otimes \tilde{F}(Y) \rightarrow \tilde{F}(X \tilde{\otimes} Y)$. Since $c, \tilde{c}$ are epi there are isomorphisms $\phi_{X,Y}$ such that $\tilde{c}_{X,Y} = \phi_{X,Y} \circ c_{X,Y}$. Now take as an example $\tilde{h} \in H(\mathcal{C}, \tilde{F})$ and calculate its coproduct: $\Delta(\tilde{h})_{X,Y} = \tilde{c}_{X,Y}^{-1} \tilde{h}_{X \tilde{\otimes} Y} \tilde{c}_{X,Y} = c_{X,Y}^{-1} \phi_{X,Y}^{-1} \tilde{h}_{X \tilde{\otimes} Y} \phi_{X,Y} c_{X,Y}$. We see that $\tilde{h} \mapsto \phi^{-1} \circ \tilde{h} \circ \phi$ is an isomorphism between the 'two-point-evaluation' of functions in $H(\mathcal{C}, \tilde{F})$ and $H(\mathcal{C}, F)$. Similar reasoning applies also to the case of n -point-evaluations.

3. The weakening procedure of Mack and Schomerus that associates to a quasitriangular Hopf algebra H a quasitriangular weak quasi Hopf algebra $\mathcal{W}(H)$ that isn't plagued by unphysical representations can now be understood in the following manner: $\mathcal{W}(H) = H(S(\text{Rep}(H)), V)$.

4. Let H be a finite dimensional ((weak) quasi) Hopf algebra. There is a natural injection¹⁴ $i : H \rightarrow H(\text{Rep}(H), V)$ given by $i(h)_X := \varrho^X(h)$. If H is semisimple this is also surjective by Wedderburns structure theorem.

3.1.1 Constructive Reconstruction

Let F be a (weak) quasi tensor functor constructed according to proposition 2. We want to explore the structure of the reconstructed (weak) quasi Hopf algebra in more detail and want to carry out the reconstruction for the Ising model.

Lemma 5 *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a semisimple, rigid braided tensor Schur category and F as in proposition 2. The covariant functions building up H are uniquely determined by their values on one object out of every irreducible equivalence class. On those they may be arbitrary while on the other members of the equivalence class the value is determined by covariance.*

Proof: We restrict ourselves to the case of an object consisting of two irreducible objects $Y = X_1 \oplus X_2$. The general case follows in the same way.

Let $f_i \in \text{Mor}(X_i, Y)$, $i = 1, 2$. By covariance we have $F(f_i)h_{X_i} = h_Y F(f_i)$ and $F(Y) = \mathbb{K} f_1 \otimes F(X_1) \oplus \mathbb{K} f_2 \otimes F(X_2)$. $F(f_i) : F(X_i) \rightarrow \mathbb{K} f_1 \otimes F(X_1) \oplus \mathbb{K} f_2 \otimes F(X_2)$, $x_i \mapsto f_i \otimes x_i$. The inverse is $F(f_i)^{-1} : f_1 \otimes x_1 \oplus f_2 \otimes x_2 \mapsto x_i$. We have $F(f_i)^{-1} F(f_i) = \text{id}_{F(X_i)}$ and $F(f_i) F(f_i)^{-1} = \text{pr}_i$. Right multiplication of the covariance equation by $F(f_i)^{-1}$ yields $F(f_i)h_{X_i} = h_Y \text{pr}_i$. This shows h_Y to be determined uniquely by h_{X_i} .

On irreducible objects in different equivalence classes covariant functions can take arbitrary values because there are no morphisms (and hence no restrictions) between inequivalent irreducible objects.

If $g \in \text{Mor}(Z_1, Z_2)$ is an isomorphism between irreducible, equivalent objects. Then $F(g)$ is also iso and covariance determines h_{Z_2} by the value h_{Z_1} . $\square$

Example 1 (Ising model) *Let $\mathcal{C} := \text{Rep}(\text{Vir}(c = 1/2))$ be the representation category of the Ising model. $\mathcal{C}$ contains three irreducible equivalence classes: $[0]$, $[1/2]$, $[1]$, the equivalence classes of Vir-representations with highest weight $0, 1/16, 1/2$. Let F be the weak quasi tensor functor constructed as in proposition 2 by means of the weak dimension function $D([I]) := 2I + 1$. $H := H(\mathcal{C}, F)$ denotes the reconstructed weak quasi Hopf algebra. The elements of H have to be defined according to the lemma on the irreducible objects. On those they may be arbitrary.*

We define generators $e, f, h \in H$ to be the representation matrices of $\mathcal{U}_q(\text{sl}_2)$, $q = -i$.

$$\begin{aligned} e_0 &:= h_0 := f_0 := 0 \in \text{End}(\mathbb{C}) = \mathbb{C} \\ h_{1/2} &:= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad e_{1/2} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad f_{1/2} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ h_1 &:= \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad e_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad f_1 := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad a := [2]_q \end{aligned}$$

1. e, f, h generates H : The threefold products suffice two generate the full endomorphism algebras¹⁵.
2. Being representation matrices of $\mathcal{U}_q(\text{sl}_2)$ the generators fulfill the defining relations of this Hopf algebra: H is as an algebra a quotient of $\mathcal{U}_q(\text{sl}_2)$, $q = -i$. An expression $G(e, f, h) \in H$ vanishes iff it vanishes in all three physical irreps of $\mathcal{U}_q(\text{sl}_2)$, $q =$

¹⁴This is injective because every finite dimensional algebra possesses a faithful representation.

¹⁵This was checked with a small Mathematica program which calculates the dimension of the algebra. It is available from the author upon request.

–i So we have $H = \mathcal{U}_q(sl_2)/\mathcal{I}$, with $\mathcal{I}$ the ideal being annihilated by all physical representations of $\mathcal{U}_q(sl_2)$. This shows that H as an algebra coincides with the algebra constructed by Mack/Schomerus.

3. $\Delta(1) = c^{-1} \circ c$ is the projector on physical subrepresentations. This shows Δ, R to be the same. $S = *$ however diverges from the Mack/Schomerus antipode.

4 Gauge and Quantum Symmetry

The picture of gauge theories as developed by Doplicher, Haag and Roberts looks like this: There is a field algebra $\mathcal{F}$ and a gauge algebra $\mathcal{G}$ acting on it. The algebra of observables $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{F}$ consists of those fields that are $\mathcal{G}$ invariant. The irreducible representations $\pi_I, I \in \mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and those of $\mathcal{G}, \varrho^I, I \in \mathcal{I}$ are 1-1 correlated. The total Hilbert space takes the form

$$\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \mathcal{H}_I \otimes V^I \quad (42)$$

Here $\mathcal{H}_I, V^I$ are the representation spaces of π_I, ϱ^I .

The general aim is to construct all these out of the algebra of observables since this is the only part which can be determined by observation. A first step in this direction was undertaken in the algebraic formulation of QFT (AQFT for short) where the reduced field bundle $\mathcal{F}_r$ was introduced as a replacement for the field algebra when the symmetry is not known. In $\mathcal{F}_r$ vertex operators can be defined¹⁶. It is widely belived that two dimensional conformal QFT are tractable in the framework of AQFT. In both theories the vertex operators are intertwining operators between irreps and products of irreps. They satisfy braid and fusion idenities which encode the structure of the $\mathcal{A}$ representation category and show it to be a braided tensor category.

To act as a symmetry an algebra has to have a representation category that coincides with that of $\mathcal{A}$:

algebra of observables $\mathcal{A}$	$\longleftrightarrow$	gauge algebra $\mathcal{G}$
Braiding of representations Ψ, ϵ	$\longleftrightarrow$	R element
CVO	$\longleftrightarrow$	Clebsch Gordan coefficient
fusion matrix F	$\longleftrightarrow$	6-j symbols
braid matrix B	$\longleftrightarrow$	—

The following list collects all requierments a gauge algebra has to fulfill.

1. **Products of representations:** Produkts of $\mathcal{G}$ -covariant field operators will transform under some tensor product representation. Therefore $\mathcal{G}$ must have a coproduct (or somthing similar) to allow products of representations. Neither coassociativity nor cocommutativity are requiered a priori.
2. **Structure of the representation category:** We need to associate a $\mathcal{G}$ representation to every equivalence class of $\mathcal{A}$ representations. The reduction of tensor products has to be the same. Put in a mathematical language: We need a tensor functor $G : \text{Rep}(\mathcal{A}) \rightarrow \text{Rep}(\mathcal{G})$ that maps inequivalent irreps to inequivalent irreps and preserves the structure constants.
3. **Invariance of vacuum:** The vacuum has to be invariant¹⁷, i.e. it must transform under a one dimensional representation:

$$\varrho(a)|0\rangle = |0\rangle\epsilon(a) \quad (43)$$

¹⁶See [7] for details.

¹⁷This requirement rules out ultraweak quasi Hopf algebras as symmetry algebras. They would turn the gauge symmetry into a broken symmetry.

4. **Unitarity:** To maintain a quantum mechanical interpretation we need a Hilbert space where the gauge algebra acts unitarily:

$$\varrho(a^*) = \varrho(a)^* \quad \Delta(a^*) = \Delta(a)^* \quad \epsilon(a^*) = \epsilon(a)^* \quad (44)$$

The weak quasi Hopf algebra reconstructed in the last chapter fulfills this requirement. Our second step is now to build a gauge covariant field algebra.

Preliminaries: We choose bases $e_i^I, i = 1 \dots \dim(V^I)$ in the representation spaces V^I of the $\mathcal{G}$ representation ϱ^I and in the morphism spaces: $\chi(C_S^R) \in \text{Mor}(\varrho^C \otimes \varrho^S, \varrho^R)$. The χ are analogous to Clebsch Gordan coefficients:

$$\chi \begin{pmatrix} R \\ C \ S \end{pmatrix} (e_c^C \otimes e_s^S) = \sum_r \begin{bmatrix} C & S & R \\ c & s & r \end{bmatrix} e_r^R \quad (45)$$

Sine the representation categories of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ are equivalent the braiding and fusion in $\mathcal{A}$ carry over from braiding and fusion of vertex operators $\phi(e)$ of $\mathcal{A}$.

$$\chi(e_2)(id \otimes \chi(e_2)) = \sum_{e'_1, e'_2} B_{e_1, e_2; e'_2, e'_1}^\pm \chi(e'_1)(id \otimes \chi(e'_2)) \quad (46)$$

$$\chi(e_2)(id \otimes \chi(e_2)) = \sum_{e, f} F_{e_1, e_2; f, e} \chi(e)(\chi(f) \otimes id) \quad (47)$$

$$\phi(e_2)(id \otimes \phi(e_2)) = \sum_{e'_1, e'_2} B_{e_1, e_2; e'_2, e'_1}^\pm \phi(e'_1)(id \otimes \phi(e'_2)) \quad (48)$$

$$\phi(e_2)(id \otimes \phi(e_2)) = \sum_{e, f} F_{e_1, e_2; f, e} \phi(e)(\phi(f) \otimes id) \quad (49)$$

$$(50)$$

We use frequently multiindices $e = {}^\alpha (C_S^R)$ and call $c(e) = C$ the charge, $s(e) = S$ the source and $r(e) = R$ the range of e or $\phi(e)$. $\alpha = 1 \dots \dim(\text{Mor}(C \otimes S, R))$

The same argument shows that the adjoint coefficients coincide.

$$\phi(e)(h_C \otimes \cdot)^* = \sum_{e^*} \tilde{\eta}_{e, e^*} \phi(e^*)(\widetilde{h_C} \otimes \cdot) \quad (51)$$

$$\chi(e)(v^C \otimes \cdot)^* = \sum_{e^*} \tilde{\eta}_{e, e^*} \chi(e^*)(\widetilde{v^C} \otimes \cdot) \quad (52)$$

Where $\tilde{\eta}_{e, e^*}$ is upto a normalization the usual η matrix of AQFT. The vectors $\widetilde{h_C} \in \mathcal{H}_{C^*}, \widetilde{v^C} \in V^{C^*}$ are determined uniquely but they are irrelevant for our discussion.

Matrix elements of $R \in \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{G}$ and $\phi \in \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{G} \otimes \mathcal{G}$ are written according to the following example: $\phi_{c_1, c_2, c_3}^{C_1, C_2, C_3, c'_1, c'_2, c'_3} = (\varrho_{c_1}^{C_1, c'_1} \otimes \varrho_{c_2}^{C_2, c'_2} \otimes \varrho_{c_3}^{C_3, c'_3})(\phi)$

The action on basis vectors is

$$\sum_{c'_3, c'_2, c'_1} \phi_{c_3, c_2, c_1}^{C_3, C_2, C_1; c'_3, c'_2, c'_1} e_{c'_3}^{C_3} \otimes (e_{c'_2}^{C_2} \otimes e_{c'_1}^{C_1}) = \phi((e_{c_3}^{C_3} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2}) \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1}) \quad (53)$$

4.1 Vertex SOS Transformation

The following concatenation of vertex operators can be carried out in two ways:

$$\chi \begin{pmatrix} R \\ C_2 \ Q \end{pmatrix} (id \otimes \chi \begin{pmatrix} Q \\ C_1 \ S \end{pmatrix}) (e_{c_2}^{C_2} \otimes (e_{c_1}^{C_1} \otimes e_s^S)) = \sum_{q, r} \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & S & Q \\ c_1 & s & q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & Q & R \\ c_2 & q & r \end{bmatrix} e_r^R \quad (54)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \chi\left(\begin{smallmatrix} R \\ C_2 \ Q \end{smallmatrix}\right)(id \otimes \chi\left(\begin{smallmatrix} Q \\ C_1 \ S \end{smallmatrix}\right))(e_{c_2}^{C_2} \otimes (e_{c_1}^{C_1} \otimes e_s^S)) = \\
& = \sum_{\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{s}} \chi\left(\begin{smallmatrix} R \\ C_2 \ Q \end{smallmatrix}\right)(id \otimes \chi\left(\begin{smallmatrix} Q \\ C_1 \ S \end{smallmatrix}\right))((e_{c_2}^{C_2} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1}) \otimes e_s^S) = \\
& = \sum_{\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{s}} \sum_{c'_1, c'_2} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{-1; C_2, C_1; c'_2, c'_1} \\
& \quad \sum_{P, p} B^+ \chi\left(\begin{smallmatrix} R \\ C_1 \ P \end{smallmatrix}\right)(id \otimes \chi\left(\begin{smallmatrix} P \\ C_2 \ S \end{smallmatrix}\right))((e_{c'_1}^{C_1} \otimes e_{c'_2}^{C_2}) \otimes e_s^S) = \\
& = \sum_{\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{s}} \sum_{c'_1, c'_2} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{-1; C_2, C_1; c'_2, c'_1} \sum_{P, p} B^+ \chi\left(\begin{smallmatrix} R \\ C_1 \ P \end{smallmatrix}\right)(id \otimes \chi\left(\begin{smallmatrix} P \\ C_2 \ S \end{smallmatrix}\right)) \\
& \quad \sum_{\tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} \phi_{c'_1, c'_2, s'}^{C_1, C_2, S, \tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} (e_{c'_1}^{C_1} \otimes (e_{c'_2}^{C_2} \otimes e_{s'}^S)) = \\
& = \sum_{\tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{s}} \sum_{c'_1, c'_2} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{-1; C_2, C_1; c'_2, c'_1} \sum_{\tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} \phi_{c'_1, c'_2, s'}^{C_1, C_2, S, \tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} \\
& \quad \sum_{P, p} B^+_{(c_1 \ Q \ S), (c_2 \ R \ Q); (c_2 \ P \ S), (c_1 \ R \ P)} \sum_r \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & S & P \\ \tilde{c}_2 & \tilde{s}' & p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & P & R \\ \tilde{c}_1 & p & r \end{bmatrix} e_r^R \tag{55}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
B^+ &:= B^+_{(c_1 \ Q \ S), (c_2 \ R \ Q); (c_2 \ P \ S), (c_1 \ R \ P)} \\
(54) &= (55) \text{ implies:}
\end{aligned}$$

Proposition 6 (vertex SOS transformation)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_q \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & S & Q \\ c_1 & s & q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & Q & R \\ c_2 & q & r \end{bmatrix} = \sum_{P, p, c'_1, c'_2, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{-1; C_2, C_1; c'_2, c'_1} \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \\
& B^+_{(c_1 \ Q \ S), (c_2 \ R \ Q); (c_2 \ P \ S), (c_1 \ R \ P)} \sum_{\tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} \phi_{c'_1, c'_2, s'}^{C_1, C_2, S, \tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & S & P \\ \tilde{c}_2 & \tilde{s}' & p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & P & R \\ \tilde{c}_1 & p & r \end{bmatrix} \tag{56}
\end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{G}$ is coassociative this reduces to

$$\sum_q \sum_{c_1, c_2} \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & S & Q \\ c_1 & s & q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & Q & R \\ c_2 & q & r \end{bmatrix} \mathcal{R}_{c'_2, c'_1}^{C_2, C_1; c_2, c_1} = \sum_{c_1, c_2} \sum_{P, p} B^+ \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & S & P \\ c'_2 & s & p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & P & R \\ c'_1 & p & r \end{bmatrix} \tag{57}$$

This relation is called **vertex SOS transformation**¹⁸. Obviously one can transfer the inversion from $\mathcal{R}$ to B .

The vertex SOS transformation is seen from the point of $\mathcal{G}$: It relates braiding of $\mathcal{G}$ representations ($\mathcal{R}$) via $\mathcal{G}$ Clebsch Gordan coefficients to the braiding of $\mathcal{G}$ vertex operators. Since the representation categories of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{A}$ are equivalent it is clear that there must exist also a vertex SOS transformation for the $\mathcal{A}$ quantities. In AQFT this relation is well known:

$$\sum_{e_1, e_2} B_{e_1, e_2; e'_2, e'_1}^\pm T_{e_1} T_{e_2} = \rho_\alpha(\epsilon) T_{e'_2} T_{e'_1} \tag{58}$$

4.2 Field Algebra $\mathcal{F}_{u1}$

In this section we will construct a covariant field algebra. We have to make some technical assumptions which we mark by TA.

$\mathcal{F}_{u1}$ operates on (42): $\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_I \mathcal{H}_I \otimes V^I$. $P_I^A : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_I, P_I^G : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow V^I$ are the natural projections. $\mathcal{F}_{u1}$ is generated by $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{A}$ and special intertwiners. We have natural

¹⁸It was first postulated in [5] for Hopf algebras.

embeddings $i_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{u1}$ and $i_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{u1}$ operating on $h_I \otimes v^I \in \mathcal{H}_I \otimes V^I$ by $i_{\mathcal{A}}(A)(h_I \otimes v^I) := \pi_I(A)h_I \otimes v^I$ and $i_{\mathcal{G}}(g)(h_I \otimes v^I) := h_I \otimes \varrho^I(g)v^I$. $i_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $i_{\mathcal{A}}$ commute. Intertwiners between sectors are:

Definition 8 $\mathcal{F}_{u1}$ is generated by $i_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$, $i_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G})$ and intertwiners:

$$\Psi^C(h_C \otimes v^C) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \quad (59)$$

$$\Psi^C(h_C \otimes v^C) := \sum_{e,f,c(e)=c(f)=C} D_{e,f}\phi(e)(h_C \otimes \cdot) \otimes \chi(f)(v^C \otimes \cdot) \quad (60)$$

$$v^C \in V^C, h_C \in \mathcal{H}_C \quad (61)$$

$D : W \otimes W \rightarrow \mathfrak{C}, (e, f) \mapsto D_{e,f} \in \mathfrak{C}$ has to fulfill the following relations which are needed to proof braid relations in $\mathcal{F}_{u1}$.

$$\sum_{r(e_1), r(f_1)} B_{e_1, e_2; e'_2, e'_1}^+ B_{f_1, f_2; f'_2, f'_1}^- D_{e_1, f_1} D_{e_2, f_2} = D_{e'_1, f'_1} D_{e'_2, f'_2} \quad (TA:DB) \quad (62)$$

$$c(e_1) = c(f_1), c(e_2) = c(f_2), s(e_2) = r(e_1), s(e'_1) = r(e'_2), s(f_2) = r(f_1), s(f'_1) = r(f'_2) \quad (63)$$

For the proof of fusion rules we need further

$$\sum_{r(e_1), r(f_1)} F_{e_1, e_2; f, e} F_{f_1, f_2; \tilde{f}, e} D_{e_1, f_1} D_{e_2, f_2} = D_{e, \tilde{e}} D_{f, \tilde{f}} \quad (TA:DF) \quad (64)$$

$$c(e) = c(\tilde{e}), c(f) = c(\tilde{f}), s(e_2) = r(e_1), r(f) = c(e), s(f_2) = r(f_1), c(\tilde{e}) = r(\tilde{f}) \quad (65)$$

$\mathcal{F}_{u1}$ will be involutive if we have in addition

$$\sum_{e,f} D_{e,f}^* \tilde{\eta}_{e,e^*} \tilde{\eta}_{f,f^*} = D_{e^*, f^*} \quad (TA:DN) \quad (66)$$

The commutator relations between this fields and the imbeddings are straightforward: $(\varphi \in \mathcal{H}, v^C \in V^C, h_C \in \mathcal{H}_C, \varphi \in \mathcal{H})$

Definition 9

$$i_{\mathcal{G}}(g)\Psi^C(h_C, v^C)(\varphi) := \sum_{e,f,C=c(e)=c(f)} D_{e,f}\phi(e)(h_C \otimes P_{s(e)}^{\mathcal{A}}(\varphi)) \otimes \varrho^{r(f)}(g)\chi(f)(v^C \otimes P_{s(f)}^{\mathcal{G}}(\varphi)) = \quad (67)$$

$$\sum_{e,f,C=c(e)=c(f)} D_{e,f}\phi(e)(h_C \otimes P_{s(e)}^{\mathcal{A}}(\varphi)) \otimes \chi(f)(\varrho^C \otimes \varrho^{s(f)})(g)(v^C \otimes P_{s(f)}^{\mathcal{G}}(\varphi))$$

$$i_{\mathcal{A}}(A)\Psi^C(h_C, v^C)(\varphi) := \sum_{e,f,C=c(e)=c(f)} D_{e,f}\pi_R(A)\phi(e)(h_C \otimes P_{s(e)}^{\mathcal{A}}(\varphi)) \otimes \chi(f)(v^C \otimes P_{s(f)}^{\mathcal{G}}(\varphi)) = \quad (68)$$

$$\sum_{e,f,C=c(e)=c(f)} D_{e,f}\phi(e)(\pi_C \otimes \pi_{s(e)})(A)(h_C \otimes P_{s(e)}^{\mathcal{A}}(\varphi)) \otimes \chi(f)(v^C \otimes P_{s(f)}^{\mathcal{G}}(\varphi))$$

Note 5 1. The localization properties of Ψ^C stem from that of the $\mathcal{A}$ -vertices $\phi(e)$ while the gauge transformation are usually not localized.

2. It is usual (and possible without any modifications) to exclude $i_{\mathcal{G}}$ from the field algebra (They may be unwanted because they can't be localized.). We included it to have a construction that is totally symmetric between the gauge and the observable algebra. One can take for example $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{A}$. In conformal QFT it is tempting to interpret the antichiral algebra as the gauge algebra of the chiral algebra and vice versa.

The braid relations in $\mathcal{F}_{u1}$ involve a $\mathcal{R}$ matrix which has nonnumeric entries in the general case of not coassociative $\mathcal{G}$.

Proposition 7 (Braiding) *Assume that the fields $\Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2})$ and $\Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1})$ are localized so that their phi vertices obey braid relations with B^+ .*

For coassociative $\mathcal{G}$ the following braid relations hold:

$$\Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2})\Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1}) = \sum_{c'_2, c'_1} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{C_2, C_1; c'_2, c'_1} \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c'_1}^{C_1})\Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c'_2}^{C_2}) \quad (69)$$

In the general case this becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2})\Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1}) = \\ \sum_{l, l', \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2} \phi_{l, c_2, c_1}^{-1; C_2, C_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_1} \sum_{c'_2, c'_1} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{c(e_2), c(e_1); c'_2, c'_1} \sum_{\tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2} \phi_{l', c'_1, c'_2}^{C_1, C_2, \tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2} \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c'_1}^{C_1})\Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c'_2}^{C_2})i_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_l^{(3)}\phi_{l'}^{(3)}) = \\ = \sum_{c'_1, c'_2} \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c'_1}^{C_1})\Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c'_2}^{C_2})(\varrho_{c_2}^{C_2, c'_2} \otimes \varrho_{c_1}^{C_1, c'_1} \otimes i_{\mathcal{G}})(\phi^{-1; 2, 1, 3}(R \otimes 1)\phi)(72) \end{aligned}$$

With $\phi = \sum_l \phi_l^{(1)} \otimes \phi_l^{(2)} \otimes \phi_l^{(3)}$ and $\phi_{l, c_2, c_1}^{C_2, C_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_1} = \varrho^{C_2}(\phi_l^{(1)})_{c_2}^{\tilde{c}_2} \varrho^{C_1}(\phi_l^{(2)})_{c_1}^{\tilde{c}_1}$.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2})\Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1})(h \otimes e_s^S) = \\ \sum_{e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2} D_{e_1, f_1} D_{e_2, f_2} \phi(e_2)(h_{C_2} \otimes \phi(e_1)(h_{C_1} \otimes h)) \otimes \chi(f_2)(e_{c_2}^{C_2} \otimes \chi(f_1)(e_{c_1}^{C_1} \otimes e_s^S)) = \\ = \sum_{e'_1, e'_2, e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2} D_{e_1, f_1} D_{e_2, f_2} B_{e_1, e_2; e'_2, e'_1}^+ \phi(e'_1)(h_{C_1} \otimes \phi(e'_2)(h_{C_2} \otimes h)) \otimes \\ \sum_{q, r} \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & S & Q \\ c_1 & s & q \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & Q & R \\ c_2 & q & r \end{bmatrix} e_r^R = \\ = \sum_{e'_1, e'_2, r(e_1), r(e_2), r(f_1), r(f_2)} D_{e_1, f_1} D_{e_2, f_2} B_{e_1, e_2; e'_2, e'_1}^+ \phi(e'_1)(h_{C_1} \otimes \phi(e'_2)(h_{C_2} \otimes h)) \otimes \\ \sum_{P, p, c'_1, c'_2, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{C_2, C_1; c'_2, c'_1} \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \sum_{\tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} \phi_{c'_1, c'_2, s}^{C_1, C_2, S, \tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} \\ B_{f_1, f_2; f'_2, f'_1}^- \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & S & P \\ \tilde{c}_2 & \tilde{s}' & p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & P & R \\ \tilde{c}_1 & p & r \end{bmatrix} e_r^R = \\ = \sum_{e'_1, e'_2} D_{e'_1, f'_1} D_{e'_2, f'_2} \phi(e'_1)(h_{C_1} \otimes \phi(e'_2)(h_{C_2} \otimes h)) \otimes \sum_{P, p, c'_1, c'_2, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{C_2, C_1; c'_2, c'_1} \\ \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{s}} \sum_{\tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} \phi_{c'_1, c'_2, s}^{C_1, C_2, S, \tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2, \tilde{s}'} \begin{bmatrix} C_2 & S & P \\ \tilde{c}_2 & \tilde{s}' & p \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} C_1 & P & R \\ \tilde{c}_1 & p & r \end{bmatrix} e_r^R = \\ = \sum_{l, l', \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2} \phi_{l, c_2, c_1}^{-1; C_2, C_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_1} \sum_{c'_2, c'_1} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{c(e_2), c(e_1); c'_2, c'_1} \sum_{\tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2} \phi_{l', c'_1, c'_2}^{C_1, C_2, \tilde{c}'_1, \tilde{c}'_2} \\ \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c'_1}^{C_1})\Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c'_2}^{C_2})i_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_l^{-1; (3)}\phi_{l'}^{(3)})(h \otimes e_s^S) \end{aligned}$$

With $Q := r(f_1), R := r(f_2)$. The third step used the vertex sos transformation, the fourth used equation (62). $\square$

Note 6 *The operators in $\mathcal{F}_{u1}$ form a representation of the quantum plane.*

Proposition 8 (Fusion) For $(h \in \mathcal{H}_S)$ the fusion reads

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2}) \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1})(h \otimes e_s^S) &= \sum_{e,f} \sum_{c'_2, c'_1, s'} \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, c'_2, c'_1, s'} \\ &= \Psi^{c(e)} \left((P_{c(e)}^{\mathcal{A}} \otimes P_{c(e)}^{\mathcal{G}}) \Psi^{c(f)}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c'_2}^{C_2})(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c'_1}^{C_1}) \right) (h \otimes e_{s'}^S) \end{aligned} \quad (73)$$

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2}) \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1})(h \otimes e_s^S) &= \\ &= \sum_{e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2} D_{e_1, f_1} D_{e_2, f_2} \phi(e_2)(h_{C_2} \otimes \phi(e_1)(h_{C_1} \otimes h)) \otimes \chi(f_2)(e_{c_2}^{C_2} \otimes \chi(f_1)(e_{c_1}^{C_1} \otimes e_s^S)) = \\ &= \sum_{e_1, e_2, f_1, f_2} D_{e_1, f_1} D_{e_2, f_2} \sum_{e, f, \tilde{e}, \tilde{f}} F_{e_1, e_2; f, e} F_{f_1, f_2; \tilde{f}, e} \phi(e)(\phi(f)(h_{C_2} \otimes h_{C_1}) \otimes h) \otimes \\ &\quad \sum_{c'_2, c'_1, s'} \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, c'_2, c'_1, s'} \chi(\tilde{e})(\chi(\tilde{f})(e_{c'_2}^{C_2} \otimes e_{c'_1}^{C_1}) \otimes e_{s'}^S) = \\ &= \sum_{e, f} \sum_{c'_2, c'_1, s'} \phi_{c_2, c_1, s}^{-1; C_2, C_1, S, c'_2, c'_1, s'} \Psi^{c(e)}((P_{c(e)}^{\mathcal{A}} \otimes P_{c(e)}^{\mathcal{G}}) \Psi^{c(f)}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c'_2}^{C_2})(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c'_1}^{C_1}))(h \otimes e_{s'}^S) \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 9 $\mathcal{F}_{u_1}$ is closed under taking adjoints.

Proof: Using TA:DN and (51) we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^C(h_C \otimes v^C)^* &= \sum_{e, f} \sum_{e^*, f^*} D_{e, f}^* \tilde{\eta}_{e, e^*} \tilde{\eta}_{f, f^*} \phi(e^*)(\tilde{h}_C \otimes \cdot) \otimes \chi(f^*)(\tilde{v}^C \otimes \cdot) \\ &= \sum_{e^*, f^*} D_{e^*, f^*} \phi(e^*)(\tilde{h}_C \otimes \cdot) \otimes \chi(f^*)(\tilde{v}^C \otimes \cdot) \\ &= \Psi^{C^*}(\tilde{h}_C \otimes \tilde{v}^C) \end{aligned}$$

□

Note 7 The proof shows that adjoint field operators transform according to the conjugate representation.

Note 8 (Covariant Operator Products) The fusion and braiding relations proved so far are ugly since they involve nonnumerical matrices. Mack/Schomerus showed how to repair this unsatisfactory situation by absorbing these operators in the definition of a covariant operator product.

$$\Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes v^{C_2}) \times \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes v^{C_1}) := \sum_l \Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes \varrho^{C_2}(\phi_l^{(1)})v^{C_2}) \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes \varrho^{C_1}(\phi_l^{(2)})v^{C_1}) i_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi_l^{(3)}) \quad (74)$$

This product is not associative. Altering the parentheses yields conjugation by $i_{\mathcal{G}}(\phi)$.

Fusion and braiding now look like

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2}) \times \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1})(h \otimes e_s^S) &= \\ &= \sum_{e, f} \Psi^{c(e)}((P_{c(e)}^{\mathcal{A}} \otimes P_{s(e)}^{\mathcal{G}}) \Psi^{c(f)}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2})(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1}))(h \otimes e_s^S) \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2}) \times \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1}) &= \\ &= \sum_{c_2, c_1} \mathcal{R}_{c_2, c_1}^{c(e_2), c(e_1); c_2, c_1} \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes e_{c_1}^{C_1}) \times \Psi^{C_2}(h_{C_2} \otimes e_{c_2}^{C_2}) \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Note 9 We used freely ϕ^{-1} although ϕ needs not be invertible. But it always has a quasi inverse $\phi\phi^{-1} = (id \otimes \Delta)\Delta(1)$, $\phi^{-1}\phi = (\Delta \otimes id)\Delta(1)$.

The resulting factors are harmless: $\Psi^I(h \otimes v) = i_{\mathcal{G}}(1)\Psi^I(h \otimes v) = \Psi^I(h \otimes \varrho^I(1_l^{(1)})v)i_{\mathcal{G}}(1_l^{(2)})$ with $\Delta(1) = \sum_l 1_l^{(1)} \otimes 1_l^{(2)}$. This shows: $\Psi^I(h_I \otimes v^I)\Psi^J(h_J \otimes v^J) = i_{\mathcal{G}}(1)\Psi^I(h_I \otimes v^I)\Psi^J(h_J \otimes v^J) = \Psi^I(h_I \otimes \varrho^I(\cdot)v_I)\Psi^J(h_J \otimes \varrho^J(\cdot)v_J)i_{\mathcal{G}}(\cdot)((id \otimes \Delta)\Delta(1))$.

Note 10 The Ψ may be further specialised by setting

$$\Gamma_i^I := \Psi^I(h_I \otimes e_i^I) \quad (77)$$

Where h_I is the highest weight vector in $\mathcal{H}_I$.

Writing $\Delta(g) = \sum_l g_l^{(1)} \otimes g_l^{(2)}$ the transformation rule becomes

$$i_{\mathcal{G}}(g)\Gamma_i^I = \sum_{l,k} \Gamma_k^I \varrho^I(g_l^{(1)})_{i,k} i_{\mathcal{G}}(g_l^{(2)}) \quad (78)$$

This is the form postulated by Mack/Schomerus.

Note 11 Correlations $\langle 0 | \Psi^{C_n}(h_{C_n} \otimes v^{C_n}) \circ \dots \circ \Psi^{C_1}(h_{C_1} \otimes v^{C_1}) | 0 \rangle$, $h_{C_i} \in \mathcal{H}_{C_i}$, $v^{C_i} \in V^{C_i}$ transform covariantly under the gauge algebra. If the trivial representation occurs in the reduction of $\varrho^{C_n} \tilde{\otimes} \dots \tilde{\otimes} \varrho^{C_1}$ this correlation may be gauge invariant. This is the case iff $v^{C_n} \otimes \dots \otimes v^{C_1}$ is mapped to a trivial representation via the reduction isomorphism. Such invariant correlations are called conformal blocks in CQFT. In this language our result is the same as [6] [(5.19)].

4.3 Field Algebra $\mathcal{F}_{u2}$

The construction of $\mathcal{F}_{u1}$ depends on two technical axioms. It is possible to alter the construction of $\mathcal{F}_{u1}$ in such a way that these axioms are at least in the case of AQFT always satisfied.

The starting point is the following observation: Rigid braided tensor categories are involutive. To every isomorphism $\text{Rep}(\mathcal{A}) \cong \text{Rep}(\mathcal{G})$ there is a second one defined by an additional involution (Since we are mainly interested in AQFT we write $\bar{I}$ instead of I^*).

$\mathcal{F}_{u2}$ operates on $\mathcal{H} := \bigoplus_I \mathcal{H}^I \otimes V^{\bar{I}}$. $P_I^{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_I$, $P_I^{\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow V^{\bar{I}}$ denote the natural projections. $\mathcal{F}_{u2}$ is generated by $\mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{A}$ and intertwiners. We have natural embeddings $i_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{u2}$ and $i_{\mathcal{G}} : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_{u2}$ operating on $h_I \otimes v^{\bar{I}} \in \mathcal{H}_I \otimes V^{\bar{I}}$ as $i_{\mathcal{A}}(A)(h_I \otimes v^{\bar{I}}) := \pi_I(A)h_I \otimes v^{\bar{I}}$ and $i_{\mathcal{G}}(g)(h_I \otimes v^{\bar{I}}) := h_I \otimes \varrho^{\bar{I}}(g)v^{\bar{I}}$. $i_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $i_{\mathcal{A}}$ commute.

Definition 10 $\mathcal{F}_{u2}$ is generated by $i_{\mathcal{A}}(\mathcal{A})$, $i_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G})$ and intertwiners:

$$\Psi^C(h_C \otimes v^{\bar{C}}) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H} \quad (79)$$

$$\Psi^C(h_C \otimes v^{\bar{C}}) := \sum_{e, \bar{e}, c(e)=C, c(\bar{e})=\bar{C}} D_{e, \bar{e}} \phi(e)(h_C \otimes \cdot) \otimes \chi(\bar{e})(v^{\bar{C}} \otimes \cdot) \quad (80)$$

$$v^{\bar{C}} \in V^{\bar{C}}, h_C \in \mathcal{H}_C \quad (81)$$

$D : W \otimes W \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, $(e, f) \mapsto D_{e,f} \in \mathbb{C}$ must satisfy:

$$\sum_{r(e_1), r(\bar{e}_1)} B_{e_1, e_2; e'_1, e'_2}^+ B_{\bar{e}_1, \bar{e}_2; \bar{e}'_1, \bar{e}'_2}^- D_{e_1, \bar{e}_1} D_{e_2, \bar{e}_2} = D_{e'_1, \bar{e}'_1} D_{e'_2, \bar{e}'_2} \quad (TA:DB) \quad (82)$$

$$c(e_1) = c(\bar{e}_1), c(e_2) = c(\bar{e}_2), s(e_2) = r(e_1), s(e'_1) = r(e'_2), s(\bar{e}_2) = r(\bar{e}_1), s(\bar{e}'_1) = r(\bar{e}'_2) \quad (83)$$

$$\sum_{r(e_1), r(\bar{e}_1)} F_{e_1, e_2; f, e} F_{\bar{e}_1, \bar{e}_2; \bar{f}, \bar{e}} D_{e_1, \bar{e}_1} D_{e_2, \bar{e}_2} = D_{e, \bar{e}} D_{f, \bar{f}} \quad (TA:DF) \quad (84)$$

$$c(e) = c(\bar{e}), c(f) = c(\bar{f}), s(e_2) = r(e_1), r(f) = c(e), s(\bar{e}_2) = r(\bar{e}_1), c(\bar{e}) = r(\bar{f}) \quad (85)$$

$\mathcal{F}_{u2}$ will be involutive if:

$$\sum_{e, \bar{e}} D_{e, \bar{e}}^* \tilde{\eta}_{e, e^*} \tilde{\eta}_{\bar{e}, \bar{e}^*} = D_{e^*, \bar{e}^*} \quad (TA:DN) \quad (86)$$

In algebraic QFT there are always solutions: $D_{e, \bar{e}} := \zeta_{e, \bar{e}}$. This setting transforms TA:DF and TA:DB to well known identities in AQFT (see [26]). TA:DN can also be reduced to a standard formula ([30]) by bringing the second η to the right by means of orthogonality.

5 Was it all worth it?

Is the generality of weak quasi quantum groups really needed or can one do with ordinary quantum groups? We split our answer in two parts:

5.1 Truncation is unavoidable

The (chiral) observable algebra of minimal conformal models is just the Virasoro algebra. The simplest example is the Ising model with fusion rules $\sigma \times \sigma = 1 + \epsilon, \sigma \times \epsilon = \epsilon \times \sigma = \sigma, \epsilon \times \epsilon = 1$. Assume the dimension of the representations of the symmetry algebra to be $D(1) = 1, D(\sigma) = n, D(\epsilon) = m \in \mathbb{N}$. We deduce $n^2 = 1 + m, nm = n \Rightarrow m = 1, n = \sqrt{2}$. This shows that there can't be a dimension function for the Ising model. Truncation have to take place leaving only room for weak dimension functions.

This kind of argument was generalized by H. Kratz to all minimal models with multiplicities $N_{I,J}^K \in \{0, 1\}$ [9].

5.2 Weak Quasi Hopf algebras are unavoidable

Mack and Schomerus [11] have shown that an ordinary quantum group as symmetry algebra contradicts with the existence of braid relations on all of $\mathcal{H}$.

Here is an argument that works also in the general case treated in this paper: Consider the fusion (proposition 8) in the case of an ordinary quantum group (i.e. ϕ trivial) and assume truncation of some unphysical representations to be carried out by hand. Apply the fusion formula to $\Psi^{C_0}(h_{C_0} \otimes v^{C_0})|0\rangle$, where v^{C_0} and the quantum group vector $v_1 \in V^{C_1}$ of the second operator are chosen so that their tensor product is unphysical. Then the lefthand side of the equation is zero because of truncation. However the righthand side will not always vanish: We can set $C_2 := C_1^*$ and by rigidity we can find a $v_2 \in V^{C_2}$ such that its tensor product with v_1 will not vanish. Therefore the right hand side gets a contribution in the C_0 sector.

6 Remarks and open questions

1. In contrast to the classical case analysed by Doplicher and Roberts neither the weak dimension function, the weak quasi tensor functor, the weak quasi hopf algebra nor the covariant field algebra are determined uniquely. This is strange because the dimension of the gauge representations can in principle be determined by measurement: They give the size of field multiplets and thereby determine the amplitude of particle creation processes.
2. Describe ultra weak quasi Hopf algebras broken gauge symmetries?

3. Every solution of Moore/Seiberg's equations yields a semisimple braided tensor category. In analogy to proposition 2 one can build an ultraweak quasi tensor functor from the assignment of a fixed separable hilbert space to every irreducible object: $F(X) := \mathcal{H}_0$. We expect the reconstructed ultraweak quasi Hopf algebra H to play the role of the Virasoro or Kac-Moody algebras in chiral conformal QFT. Guided by the idea "QFT = category+manifold" we ask if for every manifold M there exists a sort of parallel transport $\delta_{x,y} : H \rightarrow H$, $x, y \in M$ compatible with some space time symmetry such that one can glue the copies of H associated to every point in M to a full (chiral) observable algebra.

Acknowledgement: It is a pleasure to thank all those who helped in the trail of this work. I thank my fellow students Henrik Kratz (who contributed to parts of this paper by careful analysis and criticism), Andreas Schmidt and Wolfram Boenkost for discussions and Professor F. Constantinescu for his continous interest in this work.

G. Mack gave introduction to weak quasi hopf algebras, K.-H. Rehren explained details of his work, S. Majid and J. E. Roberts gave valuable criticism.

Thanks to the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes for financial support and more.

Almost nothing of the theory presented here is really new. In fact this paper is nothing more than a footnote to the work of Kerler, Mack/Schomerus and Majid.

References

- [1] P. Deligne, J. S. Milne: Tannakian Categories, in P. Deligne et al, Springer LNM 900
- [2] S. Doplicher, J. E. Roberts: Why there is a field algebra with a compact gauge group describing the superselection structure of particle physics, Comm. Math. Ph. 131, 51-107 (1990)
- [3] S. Doplicher, J. E. Roberts: A New Duality Theory for Compact Groups, Invent. Math. 98, 157-218 (1989)
- [4] V.G. Drinfeld: Quasi-Hopf Algebras and Knizhnik-Zamolodchikov Equations, in A. A. Belavin: Problems of Modern QFT, Springer 1989
- [5] G. Felder, J. Fröhlich, G. Keller: On the structure of Unitary Conformal Field Theory II, Comm. Math. Ph. 130, 1-49, (1990)
- [6] C. Gomez, G. Sierra: The Quantum Symmetry of RCQFT, Nucl. Ph. B352, 791-828 (1991)
- [7] R. Häring: Quanten-Symmetrie, diploma thesis, in preparation
- [8] T. Kerler: Non-Tannakian Categories in QFT, Preprint ETH-TH/91-51
- [9] H. Kratz: Axiomatik und Quantensymmetrien rationaler konformer QFT, diploma thesis, in preparation
- [10] S. MacLane: Categories for the working Mathematician, Springer LNM
- [11] G. Mack, V. Schomerus: Conformal Field Algebras with Quantum Symmetry from the Theory of Superselection Sectors, Comm. Math. Ph. 134, 139-196 (1990)
- [12] G. Mack, V. Schomerus: Quasi Hopf quantum symmetry in quantum theory, Nucl. Ph. B370, 185-230 (1992)
- [13] G. Mack, V. Schomerus: Quasi quantum group symmetry and local braid relations in the conformal Ising model, Phys. Lett. B267, 207 (1991)
- [14] G. Mack, V. Schomerus: Quantum Symmetry in Quantum Theory, DESY preprint 91-144 and Action of Truncated Quantum Groups on Quasi-Quantum Planes and a Quasi-Associative Differential Geometry and Calculus, Comm. Math. Ph. 149, 513-548 (1992)
- [15] S. Majid: Quaitriangular Hopf Algebras and Yang-Baxter-Equations, Int. J. Mod. Ph. A5(1), 1-91 (1990)

- [16] S. Majid: Reconstruction Theorems and RCQFT, *Int. J. of Mod. Ph. A*6(24), 4359-4374 (1991)
- [17] S. Majid: Quasi-Quantum Groups as Internal Symmetries of Topological QFTs, *Lett. Math. Ph.* 22, 83-90 (1991)
- [18] S. Majid: Braided Groups and Algebraic QFTs, *Lett. Math. Ph.* 22, 167-176 (1991)
- [19] S. Majid: Examples of braided groups and braided matrices, *J. Math. Phys.* 32, 3246-3253 (1991)
- [20] S. Majid: Rank of Quantum Groups and Braided Groups in dual Form, in: P. Kulish: *Quantum Groups*, LNM 1510, Springer 1991
- [21] S. Majid: Tannaka-Krein Theorems for Quasi-Hopf Algebras and other results, *Contemp. Math.* 134, 219 (1992)
- [22] S. Majid: private communication
- [23] G. Moore, N. Reshetikhin: A Comment on Quantum Group Symmetry in CQFT, *Nucl. Ph. B*328, 557 (1989)
- [24] G. Moore, N. Seiberg: Classical and Quantum CFT, *Comm. Math. Ph.* 123, 177-254 (1989)
- [25] K.-H. Rehren: Braid Group Statistics, in: *Geometry and Physics*
- [26] K.-H. Rehren: Space-Time Fields and Exchange Fields, *Comm. Math. Ph.* 132, 461-483 (1990)
- [27] K.-H. Rehren: Quantum Symmetry associated with Braid Group Statistics, in: H.-D. Doebner: *Quantum Groups*, Proceedings Clausthal, Springer 1989
- [28] K.-H. Rehren: Field Operators for Anyons and Plektons, *Comm. Math. Ph.* 145, 123-148 (1992)
- [29] K.-H. Rehren: Quantum Symmetry associated with Braid Group Statistics II, Preprint DESY 91-136
- [30] K.-H. Rehren: private communication
- [31] V. Schomerus: private communication
- [32] V. Schomerus: Quantum-Symmetry in Quantum Theory, PhD thesis, Hamburg 1993
- [33] K.-H. Ulbrich: On Hopf-Algebras and Rigid Monoidal Categories, *Israel J. Math.* 72, 252-256 (1990)
- [34] S. L. Woronowicz: Tannaka-Krein duality for compact matrix pseudo groups, *Invent. Math.* 93, 35-76 (1988)